

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-16 and 18 are rejected.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner states that the substitute specification filed October 15, 2007 has not been entered because it does not conform to 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c). The Applicants respectfully submit that a marked-up copy of the substitute specification was supplied on October 15, 2007. The Image File Wrapper in Private PAIR for this application includes a scanned version of the marked-up specification. The marked-up specification is identified with a Document Description of "Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment." Furthermore, the substitute specification was provided only to include section headings as requested by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants submit that the substitute specification filed on October 15, 2007 includes no new matter. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification, and that the substitute specification be entered.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Petrantoni (US 5,584,221). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Petrantoni does not disclose each and every element of previously presented claim 1. In particular, the last paragraph of claim 1 recites screws from the magazine are fed in succession to the holding portion under action of the first biasing means and releasably restrained within the holding portion following retraction of the screwdriver bit from the holding portion, in combination with the other elements of claim 1. Petrantoni does not disclose such features. On the contrary, Petrantoni shows spring 25 biasing screws 32 toward the leading end of magazine 22 and not toward a holding portion that includes at least one pivotable jaw (Col. 6, lines 7-8 and Fig. 2). As such, Petrantoni does not disclose feeding screws from the magazine in succession to the holding portion under action of the first biasing means. Furthermore, Petrantoni does not disclose releasably restraining screws within the holding portion following retraction of the screwdriver bit from the holding portion. On the contrary, Petrantoni discloses driving screws 32 into the holding portion with driving bit 20. A screw is not releasably restrained within the holding portion following retraction of the screwdriver bit. The holding portion of Petrantoni is empty following retraction of the screwdriver bit.

In addition, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 recites the holding portion comprising at least one jaw pivotable about a longitudinal axis between first and second positions, in combination with the other elements of claim 1. The Applicants respectfully submit that Petrantoni does not disclose a screw feeder as claimed. On the

contrary, Petrantoni discloses a three-sectioned expanding screw retention chuck. The three sections are positioned within discharge housing 40. Discharge housing 40 is internally splined as at 43 to receive radially disposed fins 44, there being one fin 44 integral with each of the three internal chuck sections and there being one fin received within each spline as depicted. As such, the three chuck portions and discharge housing 40 are configured to allow radial outward expansion of the three piece chuck (Col. 5, lines 40-56, Figure 3).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Petrantoni discloses radially moveable chuck portions but does not disclose a holding portion having at least one jaw pivotable about a longitudinal axis as claimed.

Claim 16 includes the relevant elements previously discussed as well. Based on the presented arguments, the Applicants respectfully submit that Petrantoni does not anticipate any of the presently pending claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections to claims 1-16 and 18 and that the case be passed to allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1222.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 30, 2008

By: Donald G. Walker
Donald G. Walker, Reg. No. 44,390

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600